UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/774,236	01/29/2001	Daniel Isaac Goodman	21939-05720	9845

7590 11/03/2004

Marc Sockol
Squire, Sanders & Dempsey L.L.P.
600 Hansen Way
Palo Alto, CA 94304-1043

EXAMINER	
KHOSHNOODI, NADIA	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2133	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/774,236	GOODMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nadia Khoshnoodi	2133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *29 January 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-142* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-142* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *29 January 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *8/8-19-2002*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Part III DETAILED ACTION

Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

The disclosure is inconsistent with the figures:

In line 4 of paragraph 49, the disclosure describes element 250 as feeding the "page" into a graphics device, whereas fig. 2 depicts the layout being fed into the graphics device. Whether the figure or the disclosure is incorrect, please make and submit appropriate corrections.

In lines 5 and 10 of paragraph 51, applicants refer to element 280 of fig. 2 as the String module. The figure, however, depicts element 280 as the "String Size Module."

Appropriate corrections are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 20, 45, 65, 71, 86, 92, 102, 113, and 118-120 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claims 20, 45, 65, 86, 102, and 113:

The phrase "substantially," as it appears in line 2, renders these claims indefinite. In order to correctly define the scope of the claims so that these claims could be further treated on their merits, the word "substantially" has been disregarded.

As per claims 71 and 92:

Claims 71 and 92 recites "a portion of encrypted text" where a portion of encrypted text has been previously introduced in claims 51 and 72 from which 71 and 92 derive. Therefore, it is unclear if applicants are referring to a new encrypted portion or the previously introduced one. In order to further treat this claim on its merits it is presumed that applicants intended to put "the" in place of "a" in line 2 of claim 71 and in line 3 of claim 92.

As per claim 118:

Claim 118 recites "a second portion of text" where a second portion of text has been previously introduced in claim 115 from which 118 derives. Therefore, it is unclear if applicants are referring to a new second portion or the previously introduced one. In order to further treat this claim on its merits it is presumed that applicants intended to put "the" in place of "a" in line 1.

As per claims 119-120:

These claims are rejected by virtue of their dependency.

Claim 70 recites the limitation "the operating system function" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. In order to further treat this claim on its merits, it is presumed that applicants intended to make claim 70 depend upon claim 69 which is where "a patched operating system function" is previously introduced.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

I. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

II. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 12-15, 26-28, 30-33, 37-40, 51-53, 55-60, 71-74, 76-81, 92-95, 97, 101, 103-106, 108, 112, 114, 133, 135, 137, and 139 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being fully anticipated by Howard et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045.

As per claims 1 and 26:

Howard et al. teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer, comprising identifying a designated portion of original content contained within a page to be protected (paragraph 44, lines 3-5), encrypting the designated portion of original content to form a portion of encrypted content (paragraph 46, lines 6-10), replacing the designated portion of original content within the page with the portion of encrypted content is (inherent, however this concept is suggested by paragraph 61, lines 8-11), rendering[1] the page into a graphics device comprising

---

[1] Although the word "render" was not specifically used, the definition according to www.netlingo.com shows that the function of rendering does take place. Below is the definition of render used.

> **Render** - To depict something. For example, an HTML author creatively renders text and graphics on a Web page into columns and rows, and a browser automatically renders the Web page by interpreting the HTML code.

decrypting the portion of encrypted content (paragraph 51, lines 1-4), displaying at least a portion of data from the graphics device (paragraph 50, lines 1-6 corresponding to applicants' definition of items specified to be a graphics device on page 12, paragraph 49, lines 5-6).

As per claims 2, 27, 52, 73, 94, and 105:

Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the page is a web page (paragraph 38, lines 12-19).

As per claims 3, 28, 53, 74, 95, and 106:

Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the web page is an HTML page (paragraph 37, lines 1-25 and paragraph 39, lines 1-3).

As per claims 5, 30, 55, 76, 97, and 108:

Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the page is part of a document produced by a software application (paragraph 34).

As per claims 6, 31, 56, and 77:

Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the graphics device is a memory device (paragraph 50, lines 1-6).

As per claims 7, 32, 57, and 78:

Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the graphics device is a screen device (paragraph 40, lines 23-25 and paragraph 88, lines 5-11).

As per claims 8, 33, 58, and 79:

Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the graphics device is a graphics

port[2] (paragraph 39 and paragraph 40, lines 23-34). Although there is no explicit reference made to a graphics port, the elements referred to in the detailed description use ports to transfer graphics, thus it is identical to there being a graphics port.

As per claims 12, 37, 101, and 112:

Howard et al. teach the method wherein the content and said encrypting comprises padding encrypted text so that identical words have distinct encrypted representations (paragraph 46, lines 6-10). Although the term padding is not used, the definition of padding[3] suggests that it is inherent.

As per claims 13, 38, 59, and 80:

Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein said rendering[4] comprises converting content into graphics output (paragraph 51, lines 1-4 and paragraph 68).

---

[2] The definition of port as pasted from www.netlingo.com is as follows:

> **Port** - Commonly known as the place where information goes into and out of a computer, or both. For example, the serial port on a personal computer is where a modem or printer is connected.
>
> On the Internet, "port" often refers to a number that is shown in a URL, following a colon right after the domain name. Every service on an Internet server "listens" on a particular port number. Most of these services have standard port numbers. Web servers normally listen on port 80, and the standard Gopher port is 70. (Services can also listen on nonstandard ports, in which case the port number must be specified in a URL when the server is accessed.)

[3] According to the Hacking Lexicon dictionary online, the definition of padding is as follows:

> **Padding** - Padding is the process of adding unused data to the end of a message in order to make it conform to a certain length. For example, block-ciphers often work on blocks that are 64-bits (8-bytes) long. Therefore, if you have a message that is 77-bytes long, you will need to "pad" it with an extra 3-bytes to make it an even 80-bytes in size (10-blocks).
> **Key point:** Padding is a regular feature of all crypto algorithms, including hashing and encryption. Some algorithms have been broken due to poor choices for padding. Most importantly, however, the size of the message can often reveal details about its contents. For example, let's assume a protocol whereby somebody accepts something with a simple message of "yes", but when it declines, it says "no" along with a reason why it was rejected. Therefore, even though the messages are encrypted, the "yes" will be a short message but the "no" will be a long message.

[4] See footnote (1) on page 4.

As per claims 14, 39, 60, and 81:

Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the graphics output is a raster output (paragraph 40, lines 23-34). Although the term "raster output" is not explicitly used, a CRT[5] is used as the display device, hence it is identical to that of a "raster output."

As per claims 15 and 40:

Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein said identifying, said encrypting, and said replacing are performed by a server computer, and wherein said rendering and said displaying are performed by a client computer connected to the server computer over a network (paragraph 88, lines 5-11).

As per claims 51 and 72:

Howard et al. teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer, comprising accessing a page containing a portion of encrypted content (paragraph 39, lines 1-3), rendering[6] the page into a graphics device comprising decrypting the portion of encrypted content (paragraph 51, lines 1-4), and displaying at least a portion of data from the graphics device (paragraph 50, lines 1-6 corresponding to

---

[5] The definition of Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) from the Free Online Dictionary of Computing is as pasted below:

> **CRT** - An electrical device for displaying images by exciting phosphor dots with a scanned electron beam. CRTs are found in computer VDUs and monitors, televisions and oscilloscopes. The first commercially practical CRT was perfected on 29 January 1901 by Allen B DuMont.
>
> A large glass envelope containing a negative electrode (the cathode) emits electrons (formerly called "cathode rays") when heated, as in a vacuum tube. The electrons are accelerated across a large voltage gradient toward the flat surface of the tube (the screen) which is covered with phosphor. When an electron strikes the phosphor, light is emitted. The electron beam is deflected by electromagnetic coils around the outside of the tube so that it scans across the screen, usually in horizontal stripes. This scan pattern is known as a raster. By controlling the current in the beam, the brightness at any particular point (roughly a "pixel") can be varied.

[6] See footnote (1) on page 4

applicants' definition of items specified to be a graphics device on page 12, paragraph 49, lines 5-6).

As per claim 71:

Howard et al. teach the method further comprising receiving the page having a portion of encrypted content from a server computer (paragraph 88, lines 5-11).

As per claim 92:

Howard et al. teach a system further comprising a network connector and a receiver receiving the page having a portion of encrypted content from a server computer via said network connector (paragraph 39).

As per claims 93 and 104:

Howard et al. teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer, comprising identifying a designated portion of original content contained within a page to be protected (paragraph 44, lines 3-5), encrypting the designated portion of original content to form a portion of encrypted content (paragraph 46, lines 6-10), and replacing the designated portion of original content within the page with the portion of encrypted content is (inherent, however this concept is suggested by paragraph 61, lines 8-11).

As per claim 103:

Howard et al. teach a method further comprising transmitting the page with the portion of encrypted content to a client computer (paragraph 88, lines 5-11).

As per claim 114:

Howard et al. teach a system further comprising a network connector and a receiver receiving the page having a portion of encrypted content from a server computer via said network connector (paragraph 39).

As per claims 133 and 135:

Howard et al. teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer, comprising encrypting the designated portion of original content to form a portion of encrypted content (paragraph 46, lines 6-10), replacing the designated portion of original content within the page with the portion of encrypted content is (inherent, however this concept is suggested by paragraph 61, lines 8-11), and decrypting the portion of encrypted content when rendering the page into a graphics device (paragraph 51).

As per claims 137 and 139:

Howard et al. teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer, comprising accessing a page containing a portion of encrypted content (paragraph 39, lines 1-3) and decrypting the portion of encrypted content when rendering the page into a graphics device (paragraph 51).

III. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

IV. Claims 115-117, 121, 124-126, 130, 141, and 142 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being fully anticipated by Bloomberg United States Patent No. 5,761,686.

As per claims 115 and 124:

Bloomberg teaches a method/system for protecting text within a page displayed by a computer comprising formatting a page containing a first portion of text to determine a page layout (col. 14, lines 10-31) and rendering the page according to the page layout into a graphics device comprising replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text (col. 10, lines 42-48), converting second portion of text to a graphics output (col. 10, line 58 – col. 11, line 12), and writing the graphics output into the graphics device (col. 11, lines 4-12).

As per claims 116 and 125:

Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein the first portion of text has the same word width as does the second portion of text (fig. 2, element 12 and fig. 4, element 52).

As per claims 117 and 126:

Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein the graphics output is a raster output (col. 23, lines 20-24). Although the term "raster output" is not explicitly used, a CRT[7] is used as a display device, hence it is identical to that of a "raster output."

As per claims 121 and 130:

Bloomberg teaches the method wherein said formatting comprises replacing first text strings with the second text strings (col. 14, lines 19-23) and calculating widths of

[7] See footnote (5) on page 7

the second text portion based on selected font types and font sizes (col. 7, lines 55-62 and col. 12, lines 5-18).

As per claims 141 and 142:

Bloomberg teaches a method for protecting text within a page displayed by a computer comprising replacing first text strings with second text strings when formatting a page to determine a page layout (col. 12, lines 5-18) and replacing a first portion of text with a second portion of text when rendering the page according to the page layout into a graphics device (col. 10, lines 42-62).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

V. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

VI. Claims 4, 29, 54, 75, 96, and 107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045 as applied to claims 2, 27, 52, 73, 94, and 105 above, and further in view of the definition of XML, found at netlingo.com.

As per claims 4, 29, 54, 75, 96, and 107:

Howard et al. substantially teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer wherein the page is a web page. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the web page is an XML page. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system wherein the web page is an HTML page. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method disclosed in Howard et al. to incorporate the web page as an XML page. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by the definition of XML as found on www.netlingo.com and pasted below:

> A programming language/specification developed by the W3C. XML is a pared-down version of SGML, designed especially for Web documents. It enables Web authors and Web developers to create their own customized tags to provide functionality not available with HTML. For example, XML supports links that point to multiple documents (as opposed to HTML links, which can reference just one destination each). XML provides a powerful set of tools for developing a new generation of Web applications, including tools like database exchange, distribution of processing to clients, multiple views of data, intelligent agents, management of document collections, and so on.

VII. Claims 9-11, 19-25, 34-36, 44-50, 64-70, 85-91, 98-100, 102, 109-111, 113, 134, 136, 138, and 140 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045 as applied to

claims 1, 26, 51, 72, 93 and 104 above, and further in view of Bloomberg United States Patent No. 5,761,686.

As per claim 9, 34, 98, and 109:

Howard et al. substantially teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer. Also disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the content is text content (paragraph 21). Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of characters. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of characters. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to carry out the encryption based on an encoding of characters. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 8, lines 4-8.

As per claim 10, 35, 99, and 110:

Howard et al. substantially teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer. Also disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the content is text content (paragraph 21). Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of words. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said encrypting is based on encoding of words. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to carry out the encryption based on an encoding of words. This modification would have

been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 12, lines 22-29.

As per claim 11, 36, 100, and 111:

Howard et al. substantially teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer. Also disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the content is text content (paragraph 21). Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein said encrypting comprises adding leading and trailing characters to flag encrypted text. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said encrypting comprises adding leading and trailing characters to flag encrypted text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to carry out the encryption and adding leading and trailing characters to flag encrypted text. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 13, lines 22-26.

As per claim 19, 44, 64, and 85:

Howard et al. substantially teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system further comprising formatting the page to determine a page layout. However, Bloomberg teaches formatting the page to determine a page layout. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to format the page to determine a

page layout. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 3, lines 14-31 and col. 14, lines 10-23.

As per claim 20, 45, 65, 86, 102, and 113:

Howard et al. substantially teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system, as applied to claim 19 above, wherein the portion of encrypted content has the same layout within the page as the designated portion of original content. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system where the portion of encrypted content has the same layout within the page as the designated portion of original content. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to allow for the portion of encrypted content to have the same layout within the page as the designated portion of original content. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 14, lines 10-23.

As per claim 21, 46, 66, and 87:

Howard et al. substantially teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system, as applied to claim 19 above, wherein said formatting comprises decrypting encrypted content, to ensure that the page layout corresponds to a layout for a page containing the designated portion of original content. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said formatting comprises decrypting encrypted content, to

ensure that the page layout corresponds to a layout for a page containing the designated portion of original content. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to incorporate formatting comprising decrypting encrypted content to ensure that the page layout corresponds to a layout for a page containing the designated portion of original content into the method. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg as depicted in figures 4 and 5. As per claim 22, 47, 67, and 88:

Howard et al. substantially teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer. Also substantially taught by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the content is text content (paragraph 21). Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system, as applied to claim 19 above, wherein said formatting comprises calculating widths of character strings. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said formatting comprises calculating widths of character strings. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to incorporate formatting comprising of calculating widths of character strings. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 12, lines 22-29 and col. 14, lines 19-23.

As per claim 23, 48, 68, and 89:

Howard et al. substantially teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system, as applied to claim 22, wherein said formatting comprises decrypting encrypted text strings, to ensure that the page layout corresponds to a layout for a page containing the designated portion of original content. However, Bloomberg teaches the method/system wherein said formatting comprises decrypting encrypted text strings, to ensure that the page layout corresponds to a layout for a page containing the designated portion of original content. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to incorporate formatting comprising decrypting encrypted text strings, to ensure that the page layout corresponds to a layout for a page containing the designated portion of original content into the method. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg as depicted in figures 4 and 5.

As per claims 24, 49, 69, and 90:

Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system of decrypting encrypted text strings on the client's computer (paragraph 46, lines 6-10). Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. or Bloomberg is the method/system occurring within a patched operating system function for determining widths of character strings. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of securing the cached content on the client's computer, as well as using the operating system in order to hide contents in some form. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the

method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that decrypting encrypted text strings occur within a patched operating system function for determining widths of character strings. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraphs 89 and 93.

As per claims 25, 50, 70, and 91:

Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system wherein decrypting encrypted text strings occurs within a patched operating system function for determining widths of characters as applied to claims 16, 41, 61, and 82 above. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. or Bloomberg is the method/system wherein the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows GetTextExtent function. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using different versions of Microsoft operating systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows GetTextExtent function to correspond to the operating systems mentioned. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 33.

As per claims 134, 136, 138, and 140:

Howard et al. substantially teach a method/system for protecting content within a page displayed by a computer. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system further comprising decrypting an encrypted string when formatting the page to determine a page layout. However, Bloomberg teaches using the decrypted text

when formatting the page to determine a page layout. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. to format the page using the decrypted text to determine a page layout. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Bloomberg in col. 5, lines 44-50 and col. 14, lines 10-23.

IX. Claims 16-18, 41-43, 61-63, and 82-84 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Howard et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045 as applied to claims 1, 26, 51, and 72 above.

As per claims 16, 41, 61, and 82:

Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system of decrypting the portion of encrypted content/text strings on the client's computer (paragraph 46, lines 6-10). Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system occurring within a patched operating system function for outputting content. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of securing the cached content on the client's computer, as well as using the operating system in order to hide contents in some form. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that decrypting the portion of encrypted content occurs within a patched operating system function for outputting content. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraphs 89 and 93.

As per claims 17, 42, 62, and 83:

Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system of decrypting the portion of encrypted content occurring within a patched operating system function for outputting content as applied to claims 16, 41, 61, and 82 above. Also disclosed by Howard et al. is the method wherein the content is text content (paragraph 33, lines 1-5). Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows TextOut function. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using different versions of Microsoft operating systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows TextOut function to correspond to the operating systems mentioned. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 33.

As per claims 18, 43, 63, and 84:

Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system of decrypting the portion of encrypted content occurring within a patched operating system function for outputting content as applied to claims 16, 41, 61, and 82 above. Also disclosed by Howard et al. is the method wherein the content is text content (paragraph 33, lines 1-5). Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the operating system function is a Macintosh DrawText function. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using different versions of Macintosh operating systems. Therefore, it would have been

obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that the operating system function is a Macintosh DrawText function to correspond to the operating systems mentioned. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 33.

X. Claims 118-120, 122-123, 127-129, and 131-132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bloomberg United States Patent No. 5,761,686 as applied to claims 115 and 124 above, and further in view of Howard et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2001/0042045.

As per claims 118 and 127:

Bloomberg substantially teaches the method/system of replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text. Not explicitly disclosed by Bloomberg is the method occurring within a patched operating system function for converting text into the graphics output. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using the client's computer for outputting the text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that replacing the first portion of text with the second portion of text occur within a patched operating system function for converting text into the graphics output. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 88, lines 5-11.

As per claims 119 and 128:

Bloomberg and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system wherein said replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text occurs within a patched operating system function for converting text into the graphics output, as applied to claims 118 and 127 above. Not explicitly disclosed by Bloomberg or Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows TextOut function. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using different versions of Microsoft operating systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows TextOut function to correspond to the operating systems mentioned. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 33.

As per claims 120 and 129:

Bloomberg and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system wherein said replacing the first portion of text with a second portion of text occurs within a patched operating system function for converting text into the graphics output, as applied to claims 118 and 127 above. Not explicitly disclosed by Bloomberg or Howard et al. is the method/system wherein the operating system function is a Macintosh DrawText function. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using different versions of Macintosh operating systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard

et al. so that the operating system function is a Macintosh DrawText function to correspond to the operating systems mentioned. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 33.

As per claims 122 and 131:

Bloomberg substantially teaches the method/system wherein said formatting comprises replacing first text strings with second text strings and calculating widths of the second text strings based on selected font types and font sizes as applied to claims 121 and 130 above. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. or Bloomberg is the method/system occurring within a patched operating system function for determining widths of character strings. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using the client's computer to carry out operations that occur before outputting. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Bloomberg so that replacing first text strings with second text strings occurs within a patched operating system function for determining widths of character strings. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 88, lines 5-11.

As per claims 123 and 132:

Bloomberg and Howard et al. substantially teach the method/system wherein replacing first text strings with second text strings occurs within a patched operating system function for determining widths of characters as applied to claims 122 and 131

above. Not explicitly disclosed by Howard et al. or Bloomberg is the method/system wherein the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows GetTextExtent function. However, Howard et al. teach the method/system of using different versions of Microsoft operating systems. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method/system disclosed in Howard et al. so that the operating system function is a Microsoft Windows GetTextExtent function to correspond to the operating systems mentioned. This modification would have been obvious because a person having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, would have been motivated to do so since it is suggested by Howard et al. in paragraph 33.

**References Cited, Not Used:*

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

(1) US Patent No. 6,282,653
(2) US Patent No. 6,052,780
(3) US Patent No. 5,822,432
(4) US Pub. No. 2002/0188570
(5) US Pub No. 2002/0021807

The previously cited references are relevant due to the manner in which the invention has been claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nadia Khoshnoodi whose telephone number is (703) 305-8701. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (703) 305-9595. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nadia Khoshnoodi
Examiner
Art Unit 2133
10/19/2004

NK

Guy J. LAMARRE
PRIMARY EXAMINER